



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,257	05/25/2001	Dale Lowry	26530.56	4956

27683 7590 12/29/2003

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/865,257

Applicant(s)

LOWRY ET AL.

Examiner

Farhood Moslehi

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 21-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 21-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1,21-40 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slaughter et al. (6,643,650) (hereinafter Slaughter).

4. As per claim 1, Slaughter describes a computer system for facilitating distributed directory-enabled application using an extensible Markup language ("XML") application program interface, the system comprising:

At least one processor (e.g. col. 6, lines 22-30);

Art Unit: 2126

At least one memory accessible to the processor (e.g. col. 6, lines 22-30);

A first application stored in a first portion of the memory (e.g. col. 26, lines 28-38);

A second application stored in a second portion of the memory (e.g. col. 26, lines 28-38);

Software for an event system, the software comprising instructions for publishing an event by either the first or second application, subscribing to the event by the other application, whereby the first and second applications interact with each other through the event system (e.g. col. 31, lines 61-66);

Software for parsing XML files for the first and second applications, the software comprising instructions for accepting an XML file as an input stream, parsing the input stream, dynamically loading system services referenced in the input stream, and configuring the services (e.g. col. 25, lines 32-43); and software for bridging, the software for comprising instructions for thread safeness, whereby a bridge utilizes semaphore access control to control thread access, smart pointers, whereby the bridge automatically manages the memory it requires, and opaque interfaces, whereby the bridge maintains interface compatibility when implementation changes occur in an interface (e.g. col. 77, lines 37-52).

5. Claim 21-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hemphill et al. (6,167,448) (hereinafter Hemphill).

6. As per claim 21, Hemphill describes a method for providing an event system in a distributed directory-enabled application environment using an extensible Markup Language ("XML") application program interface, the interface including at least one

Art Unit: 2126

event delineated by an event parameter, the event defining an object delineated by an object property and an object parameter, the method comprising: defining at least one subscription filter allowing subscriber to selectively filter the event (e.g. col. 4, lines 58-65);

Publishing the event (e.g. col. 4, lines 63-65);

Retrieving a subscriber list, the list including the subscriber and the subscription filter (e.g. col. 4, lines 32-38);

Selecting the subscriber and the subscription filter from the list (e.g. col.4, lines 48-57);

Filtering the event through the subscription filter (e.g. col. 4, lines 49-57);

Passing the event to the subscriber if the event passes through the subscription filter (e.g. col. 4, lines 49-57); and acting on the event (e.g. col. 4, lines 32-45).

7. As per claim 31, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

8. As per claim 22, Hemphill clearly shows the method further including filtering the event through an event filter based on the event parameter (e.g. col. 10, lines 49-54).

9. As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

10. As per claim 23, Hemphill clearly shows the method further including acting on the event by altering the event parameter, so that the event is transformed through the alteration (e.g. col. 9, lines 26-45).

11. As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

12. As per claim 24, Hemphill shows the method further including filtering the event through an object filter, whereby the event is filtered based on the object property (e.g. col. 11, lines 10-30).

Art Unit: 2126

13. As per claim 34 it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
14. As per claim 25, Hemphill shows the method further including acting on the event by altering the object property, so that the event is transformed through the alteration (e.g. col. 11, lines 10-30).
15. As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
16. As per claim 26, Hemphill shows the method further including filtering the event through a parameter filter, whereby the event is filtered based on the object parameter (e.g. col. 10, lines 49-54, a filter is an object therefore changing parameters in a filter and changing parameters of an object is identical operations).
17. As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
18. As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated in claims 25 and 26).
19. As per claim 37, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
20. As per claim 28, Hemphill shows the method further including acting on the event by terminating the event, so that the event is topped by the termination (e.g. col. 11, lines 10-30, it is an inherent property of JavaScript to terminate objects once they have been terminated and the objects are automatically collected via the garbage collection mechanism).
21. As per claim 38, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
22. As per claim 29, Hemphill describes the method further including tracking the event, whereby information about the event may be gathered (e.g. col. 5, lines 61-65).
23. As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2126

24. As per claim 30, Hemphill describes the method further including generating reports from the gathered information, so that the information about the event may be compiled (e.g. col. 4, lines 49-57).

25. As per claim 40, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

26. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent number 6,125,391 to Meltzer et al.

US Application Publication number 2003/0069874 to Hertzog et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

fm